

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 6, 11 and 17 as the independent claims.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,590,873 to *Li et al.* (hereinafter, *Li*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,894 to *Lin et al.* (hereinafter, *Lin*). The Examiner rejected Claims 11-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Li* in view of *Lin* and U.S. Patent No. 6,151,328 to *Kwon et al.* (hereinafter, *Kwon*).

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that the combination of *Li* and *Lin* teaches each and every element of the claims. More specifically, the Examiner contends that *Li* teaches every limitation of independent Claim 1 with the exception of the reception of reception states of first information on a first traffic channel and second information on a second traffic channel, wherein reception state indicating bits of the first and the second information are reception result indicator bits for power control on a frame basis. The Examiner cites *Lin* in an attempt to remedy these deficiencies.

*Li* teaches a reverse channel for transmitting pilot and power control bits. *Lin* discloses the use of an Erasure Indicator Bit (EIB), which indicates that the mobile unit did not accurately receive a frame.

The claims have been amended to more clearly recite the subject matter of the present invention. More specifically, amended Claim 1 more clearly set forth that the each of the plurality of multiplexed bits are allocated to one of sixteen slots of the reverse frame, and that each slot comprises a single bit. The amendments also more clearly set forth that the bits are allocated via a multiplexer. Thus, each slot of the reverse frame contains a single multiplexed bit

indicating a reception state of either the first information on the first channel or the second information on the second channel. Thus, Applicants assert that amended Claim 1 is allowable over the combination of *Li* and *Lin*.

The Examiner also rejected independent Claim 6, which has been amended in a manner similar to that of Claim 1. In view of the above, Applicants assert that amended Claim 6 is allowable over the combination of *Li* and *Lin*.

Regarding Claims 2-5 and 7-10, while not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Claims 2-5 and 7-10 would be patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent Claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 1-10 are allowable over the combination of *Li* and *Lin*, and the rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 11-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that the combination of *Li*, *Lin* and *Kwon* teaches each and every element of the claims. Claim 11 has been amended to recite the use of a MUX for allocating multiplexed reception indicating bits into slots of a reverse frame, wherein the reverse frame comprises sixteen slots and each slot comprises a single reception state indicating bit. Further, Claim 17 has been amended to recite the use of a DEMUX for receiving a reverse frame comprising sixteen slots and for separating reception state indicating bits from the reverse frame, wherein each slot comprises a single reception state indicating bit. Neither *Li* nor *Lin* teach or disclose a multiplexer or a demultiplexer, and *Kwon* fails to remedy the deficiencies of the combination of *Li* and *Lin* described above.

Regarding Claims 12-16 and 18-22, while not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Claims 12-16 and 18-22 would be patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent Claims 11 and 17. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 11-22 are allowable over the combination of *Li*, *Lin* and *Kwon*, and the rejection of Claims 11-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-22 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul V. Farrell", written over a horizontal line.

Paul V. Farrell  
Registration No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

**THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.**  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Ste. 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
(516) 228-3565